

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application, with claims 1 and 9-14 withdrawn from consideration. Claims 2-6 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 7 and 15 amended herein. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1 and 7-15 will be pending, with claims 1 and 9-14 withdrawn from consideration. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the rejections are respectfully requested.

No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Claim 7 has been amended to be in independent form, incorporating the limitations of claim 2, which is one of the claims from which it had depended. Claim 15 has been amended to depend from claim 7. As a result of this amendment, the scopes of claims 7, 8 and 15 do not include the scope of withdrawn claim 1.

**Claims 2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al. (US 5,883,199) in view of Liu et al. (J. of Environmental Polymer Design, 1997) and Hiruma et al. (JP 2002-128918) with evidence provided by Hodson (US 2006/0240726).**  
(Office action paragraph no. 2)

The rejections of pending claims 7 and 8 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicant notes that the present amendment to claim 7 only deletes the dependence of claim 7 from withdrawn claim 1.

In the present Office action, the Examiner states that the present rejection is set forth in the Office action of May 2, 2010. In that Office action, the Examiner asserted that McCarthy teaches the blends are used to make film, sheets, and other products by methods such as blown film, extrusion,

and injection molding methods. However, McCarthy does not disclose the property such as a heat resistance.

By contrast, in the present invention, it is an object to provide an injection molded article that has excellent heat resistance. The Examples of this invention show that the obtained injection molded articles have a deflection temperature under load of 50°C or more, namely, they have excellent impact strength and excellent heat resistance. Further, the molded articles of this invention are formed by using the resin composition having component (A), component (B) and component (C). When the component (C) is contained, the formed molded articles have improved elastic moduli. This prevents deformation of the molded articles when they are taken out from the mold or minimizes deformation of the molded articles when the molded articles are crystallized after molding (see page 19, lines 8-21, of the specification).

The invention of Hiruma is a shrink film. Neither Hiruma nor Hodson discloses a property such as heat resistance. Pending claims 7 and 8 are therefore not obvious over McCarthy et al. (US 5,883,199), Liu et al. (J. of Environmental Polymer Design, 1997), Hiruma et al. (JP 2002-128918) and Hodson (US 2006/0240726), taken separately or in combination.

**Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al. (US 5,883,199) in view of Liu et al. (J. of Environmental Polymer Design, 1997) and Hiruma et al. (JP 2002-128918) with evidence provided by Hodson (US 2006/0240726), further in view of Downie et al. (US 2001/0027225). (Office action paragraph no. 3)**

**Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al. (US 5,883,199) in view of Liu et al. (J. of Environmental Polymer Design, 1997) and Hiruma et**

**al. (JP 2002-128918) with evidence provided by Hodson (US 2006/0240726), further in view of Akao et al. (US 5,814,497). (Office action paragraph no. 4)**

The rejections of claims 4, 5 and 6 are moot in view of the cancellation of these claims without prejudice or disclaimer.

**Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al. (US 5,883,199) in view of Liu et al. (J. of Environmental Polymer Design, 1997) and Hiruma et al. (JP 2002-128918) with evidence provided by Hodson (US 2006/0240726), further in view of Obuchi et al. (US 6,916,950) with evidence from Wypych (2000). (Office action paragraph no. 5)**

The rejection of claim 3 is moot in view of the cancellation of this claim without prejudice or disclaimer. The rejection of claim 8 is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested. Applicant has argued above that claims 7 and 8 are not obvious over the combination of McCarthy et al. (US 5,883,199), Liu et al. (J. of Environmental Polymer Design, 1997), Hiruma et al. (JP 2002-128918) and Hodson (US 2006/0240726). Those arguments are also applicable to the present rejection.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicants' undersigned agent at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/531,952**

Response filed December 22, 2010

Reply to OA dated August 31, 2010

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

  
Daniel A. Geselowitz, Ph.D.

Agent for Applicants

Reg. No. 42,573

DAG/meu

Atty. Docket No. **050246**

Suite 400

1420 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time

H:\050\050246\Response in re FOA of 08-31-2010